

REMARKS

A Final Rejection was mailed in the case on June 22, 2010. Applicant filed an Amendment After Final Rejection on August 20, 2010. The Examiner refused to enter the Amendment as raising new issues. This Response is being submitted to accompany a Request For Continued Examination in the case. The fee for the one additional independent claim in excess of three is included in addition to the fee for the RCE. No additional fee is thought to be due at this time. If any additional fee is due for the continued prosecution of this case, please charge the same to Applicant's Deposit Account No. 50-2555 (Whitaker, Chalk, Swindle & Sawyer, LLP).

At the outset, Applicant would like to point out that, in the latest Office Action mailed on June 22, 2010, that the Examiner indicated that Claims 5-7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant had already rewritten Claim 5 in independent form in the last Amendment filed on March 26, 2010. The Examiner indicated in the Advisory Action that Claim 5 was allowed. In the present Response, Applicant has added new Claims 11 and 12 which correspond directly to dependent Claims 6 and 7 if rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant has kept original dependent Claims 6 and 7 based upon the amendment to Claim 1 discussed below.


Applicant has made one additional change in this Amendment with regard to the language of independent Claim 1, namely to cancel the phrase "or = CO_3 " on line 5 thereof. The Examiner had previously pointed out that Claim 1, as it previously stood, would cover calcium carbonate when $X = 1$ (see the Office Action of June 22, 2010, page 3, line 13). The amendment to Claim 1 insures that remaining Claims 1-4 and 6-10 now comprise a calcic compound which clearly does not cover calcium carbonate. The calcic compound is lime or magnesia, which are certainly not "abrasive compounds." The present invention, according to these claims, would certainly not be rendered obvious by Hartman which deals with abrasive compositions comprising 2-25% of expanded perlite, as abrasive agent, and optionally "conventional " abrasive mineral, (see Col. 16, lines 5-12 of Hartman).

Rewritten independent Claim 5 and new Claims 11 and 12 correspond to the claims which are considered as allowable by the Examiner in the last Office Action. In these claims, the CO₂- group is obviously maintained.

Claims 1-12 are now thought to be allowable over the art of record and an early notification of the same would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sept 21, 2010


Charles D. Gunter, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,386
Whitaker, Chalk, Swindle & Sawyer, LLP
301 Commerce St, Suite 3500
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(817) 878-0504

ATTORNEY(S) FOR APPLICANT